arXiv:1601.06336v1 [math.FA] 24 Jan 2016

STRONG 3-COMMUTATIVITY PRESERVING MAPS ON STANDARD OPERATOR ALGEBRAS

MEIYUN LIU, JINCHUAN HOU

ABSTRACT. Let X be a Banach space of dimension ≥ 2 over the real or complex field $\mathbb{F}$ and $\mathcal{A}$ a standard operator algebra in $\mathcal{B}(X)$. A map $\Phi : \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{A}$ is said to be strong 3-commutativity preserving if $[\Phi(A), \Phi(B)]_3 = [A, B]_3$ for all $A, B \in \mathcal{A}$, where $[A, B]_3$ is the 3-commutator of A, B defined by $[A, B]_3 = [[[A, B], B], B]$. The main result in this paper is shown that, if Φ is a surjective map on $\mathcal{A}$, then Φ is strong 3-commutativity preserving if and only if there exist a functional $h : \mathcal{A} \to \mathbb{F}$ and a scalar $\lambda \in \mathbb{F}$ with $\lambda^4 = 1$ such that $\Phi(A) = \lambda A + h(A)I$ for all $A \in \mathcal{A}$.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let $\mathcal{R}$ be a ring (or an algebra over a field $\mathbb{F}$). Then $\mathcal{R}$ is a Lie ring (or Lie algebra) under the Lie product $[A, B] = AB - BA$. Recall that a map Φ from $\mathcal{A}$ into itself is called a commutativity preserving map if $[\Phi(A), \Phi(B)] = 0$ whenever $[A, B] = 0$ for all A, $B \in \mathcal{R}$. The problem of characterizing commutativity preserving maps had been studied intensively (see [2, 3, 9, 13] and the references therein). Bell and Dail gave the conception of strong commutativity preserving maps in [1]. A map $\Phi : \mathcal{R} \to \mathcal{R}$ is said to be strong commutativity preserving if $[\Phi(A), \Phi(B)] = [A, B]$ for any $A, B \in \mathcal{R}$. Clearly, strong commutativity preserving maps must be commutativity preserving maps, but the inverse is not true generally. The structure of linear (or additive) strong commutativity preserving maps has been investigated in [1, 4, 5, 8]. For nonlinear strong commutativity preserving maps, with $\mathcal{R}$ being a prime unital ring containing a nontrivial idempotent element, Qi and Hou in [12] proved that every nonlinear surjective strong commutativity preserving map $\Phi : \mathcal{R} \to \mathcal{R}$ has the form $\Phi(A) = \lambda A + f(A)$ for all $A \in \mathcal{R}$, where $\lambda \in \{-1, 1\}$ and f is a map from $\mathcal{R}$ into $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{R}}$, the center of $\mathcal{R}$. Particularly, this result is true for maps on factor von Neumann algebras. In [11] the nonlinear surjective strong commutativity preserving maps on triangular algebras are studied. Recently, Liu in [7] obtained that a surjective strong commutativity preserving map $\Phi : \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{A}$ on von Neumann

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. 47B49; 47B47.

Key words and phrases. 3-commutators, standard operator algebras, Banach spaces, preservers.

This work is partially supported by Natural Science Foundation of China (11171249, 11271217).

algebras $\mathcal{A}$ without central summands of type I_1 has the form $\Phi(A) = ZA + f(A)$ for all $A \in \mathcal{A}$, where $Z \in \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{A}}$ satisfies $Z^2 = I$ and f is a map from $\mathcal{A}$ into $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{A}}$.

For a ring $\mathcal{R}$ and a positive integer k, recall that the k-commutator of elements $A, B \in \mathcal{R}$ is defined by $[A, B]_k = [[A, B]_{k-1}, B]$ with $[A, B]_0 = A$ and $[A, B]_1 = [A, B] = AB - BA$; a map $\Phi : \mathcal{R} \to \mathcal{R}$ is said to be strong k-commutativity preserving if $[\Phi(A), \Phi(B)]_k = [A, B]_k$ for all $A, B \in \mathcal{R}$. Obviously, strong k-commutativity preserving maps are usual strong commutativity preserving maps if $k = 1$. It seems the study of the problem of characterizing strong k-commutativity preserving maps was started by [10], in where it is shown that a nonlinear surjective map on a unital prime ring containing a nontrivial idempotent is strong 2-commutativity preserving if and only if it has the form $A \mapsto \lambda A + f(A)$, where λ is an element in the extended centroid of the ring satisfying $\lambda^3 = 1$ and f is a map from the ring into its center. With k increasing, the problem of characterizing strong k-commutativity preserving maps becomes much more difficult. Let $\mathcal{R}$ be a unital prime ring containing a nontrivial idempotent. It is reasonable to conjecture that a surjective map $\Phi : \mathcal{R} \to \mathcal{R}$ is strong k-commutativity preserving if and only if there exist an element λ in the extended centroid of $\mathcal{R}$ with $\lambda^{k+1} = 1$ and a map $f : \mathcal{R} \to \mathcal{Z}_{\mathcal{R}}$ such that $\Phi(A) = \lambda A + f(A)$ for all $A \in \mathcal{R}$. However, we even do not know whether or not the conjecture is true for $k = 3$. The purpose of this paper is to answer the above conjecture affirmatively for the case when $k = 3$ and the maps act on standard operator algebras on Banach spaces.

Let $\mathbb{F}$ be the real field $\mathbb{R}$ or the complex field $\mathbb{C}$ and X be a Banach space over $\mathbb{F}$. As usual, denote by $\mathcal{B}(X)$ the Banach algebra of all bounded linear operators acting on X. Recall that, a subalgebra $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{B}(X)$ is called a standard operator algebra if it contains the identity I and all finite rank operators.

The following is our main results.

Theorem 1.1. *Let X be a Banach space over the real or complex field $\mathbb{F}$ with $\dim X \geq 2$ and $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{B}(X)$ be a standard operator algebra. Assume that $\Phi : \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{A}$ is a surjective map. Then Φ is strong 3-commutativity preserving if and only if there exist a functional $h : \mathcal{A} \to \mathbb{F}$ and a scalar $\lambda \in \mathbb{F}$ with $\lambda^4 = 1$ such that $\Phi(A) = \lambda A + h(A)I$ for all $A \in \mathcal{A}$.*

2. Proof of the main result

Before proving Theorem 1.1, we give several lemmas. In this section we always assume that $\mathcal{A}$ is a standard operator algebra on a real or complex Banach space X and $\mathbb{F}$ stands for the real field $\mathbb{R}$ or the complex field $\mathbb{C}$, depending on X is real or complex. For $x \in X$ and $f \in X^*$,

we denote $x \otimes f$ for the rank one operator defined by $z \mapsto \langle z, f\rangle x$, where $\langle z, f\rangle = f(z)$. Note that, every operator of rank ≤ 1 can be written in this form.

The first lemma is obvious by the main result in [6].

Lemma 2.1. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a standard operator algebra, and let A_i, B_i, C_j, $D_j \in \mathcal{A}$, $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$, such that $\sum_{i=1}^{n} A_i T B_i = \sum_{i=1}^{n} C_j T D_j$ for all $T \in \mathcal{A}$. If $A_1, \ldots, A_n$ are linearly independent, then each B_i is a linear combination of $D_1, \ldots, D_m$. Similarly, if $B_1, \ldots, B_m$ are linearly independent, then each A_i is a linear combination of $C_1, \ldots, C_m$. In particular, if $ATB = BTA$ for all $T \in \mathcal{A}$, then A and B are linearly dependent.*

Lemma 2.2. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a standard operator algebra and $A \in \mathcal{A}$, if $[A, P]_3 = 0$ for any rank one idempotent $P \in \mathcal{A}$, then $A \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{A}) = \{\lambda I : \lambda \in \mathbb{F}\}$.*

Proof. For any nonzero vector $x \in X$, there exists $f \in X^*$ such that $\langle x, f\rangle = 1$. Let $P = x \otimes f$; then P is a rank one idempotent. By the assumption,

$$0 = [A, P]_3 = [A, x \otimes f]_3 = [A, x \otimes f] = Ax \otimes f - x \otimes A^* f,$$

which implies that Ax is linearly dependent of x. Thus, for any $x \in X$, there exists some scalar $\lambda_x \in \mathbb{F}$ such that $Ax = \lambda_x x$. It follows that there exists a scalar $\lambda \in \mathbb{F}$ such that $A = \lambda I$. Hence $A \in \mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{A}) = \{\lambda I : \lambda \in \mathbb{F}\}$. □

It was proved in [10] that, for $k = 2$, if an element S satisfies $[A, S]_k = 0$ for all A in a prime ring, then S is a central element. But, for $k \geq 3$, this result is not true anymore. For $k = 3$, we have the following lemma, which reveals one of the main difficulties to solve the problem of characterizing the maps preserving strong 3-commutativity.

Lemma 2.3. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a standard operator algebra, $\mathcal{N}_2(\mathcal{A}) = \{N \mid N^2 = 0, N \in \mathcal{A}\}$ and $S \in \mathcal{A}$. Then $[A, S]_3 = 0$ holds for all $A \in \mathcal{A}$ if and only if there exist a scalar $\lambda \in \mathbb{F}$ and an element $N \in \mathcal{N}_2(\mathcal{A})$ such that $S = \lambda I + N$.*

Proof. To check the "if" part, assume that $S = \lambda I + N$ with $N^2 = 0$. It is easily seen that

$$[A, S]_3 = [A, \lambda I + N]_3 = [A, N]_3 = AN^3 - 3NAN^2 + 3N^2AN - N^3A = 0$$

for any $A \in \mathcal{A}$.

Next we check the " only if " part.

Assume that

$$[A, S]_3 = AS^3 - 3SAS^2 + 3S^2AS - S^3A = 0 \tag{2.1}$$

for all $A \in \mathcal{A}$. By Lemma 2.1, we see that I, S, S^2 and S^3 are linearly dependent.

If I and S are linearly dependent, then $S = \lambda I$ for some $\lambda \in \mathbb{F}$ and the proof is done.

So we may suppose that I and S are linearly independent. We assert that I, S and S^2 are linearly dependent. In fact, if I, S and S^2 are linearly independent, then, by Lemma 2.1, we

get $S = \lambda I$, a contradiction. So there exist two scalars $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{F}$ such that $S^2 = \alpha I + \beta S$. Then

$$S^3 = S(\alpha I + \beta S) = \alpha S + \beta(\alpha I + \beta S) = \alpha\beta I + (\alpha + \beta^2)S$$

and it follows from Eq.(2.1) that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = \ & AS^3 - 3SAS^2 + 3S^2AS - S^3A \\ = \ & A(\alpha\beta I + (\alpha + \beta^2)S) - 3SA(\alpha I + \beta S) + 3(\alpha I + \beta S)AS - (\alpha\beta I + (\alpha + \beta^2)S)A \\ = \ & \alpha\beta A + (\alpha + \beta^2)AS - 3\alpha SA - 3\beta SAS + 3\alpha I + 3\beta SAS - \alpha\beta A - (\alpha + \beta^2)SA \\ = \ & (4\alpha + \beta^2)(AS - SA). \end{aligned}$$

Since there always exists $A \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $AS - SA \neq 0$, we must have $4\alpha + \beta^2 = 0$.

Let $\lambda = \frac{\beta}{2}$, $N = S - \lambda I$, then $\lambda^2 = -\alpha$, and

$$N^2 = S^2 - 2\lambda S + \lambda^2 I = S^2 - \beta S - \alpha I = 0.$$

So $S = \lambda I + N$ with $N \in \mathcal{N}_2(\mathcal{A})$. The proof of the Lemma 2.3 is completed. □

Now we are at the position to give our proof of the main theorem.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. The " if " part of the theorem is obvious. In the sequel, we always assume that $\Phi : \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{A}$ is a surjective strong 3-commutativity preserving map. we will check the " only if " part by several steps.

Step 1. For any $A, B \in \mathcal{A}$, there exists a scalar $\lambda_{A,B} \in \mathbb{F}$ such that $\Phi(A + B) = \Phi(A) + \Phi(B) + \lambda_{A,B} I$.

For any A, B and $T \in \mathcal{A}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & [\Phi(A + B) - \Phi(A) - \Phi(B), \Phi(T)]_3 \\ & = [\Phi(A + B), \Phi(T)]_3 - [\Phi(A), \Phi(T)]_3 - [\Phi(B), \Phi(T)]_3 \\ & = [A + B, T]_3 - [A, T]_3 - [B, T]_3 = 0. \end{aligned}$$

By the surjectivity of Φ and Lemma 2.2, above equation implies $\Phi(A + B) - \Phi(A) - \Phi(B) \in \{\lambda I : \lambda \in \mathbb{F}\}$. So the assertion in Step 1 is true.

Step 2. $\Phi(\mathbb{F}I) = \mathbb{F}I$ and $\Phi(\mathbb{F}I + \mathcal{N}_2(\mathcal{A})) = \mathbb{F}I + \mathcal{N}_2(\mathcal{A})$.

$\Phi(\mathbb{F}I) = \mathbb{F}I$ is obvious by Lemma 2.2 and the surjectivity of Φ.

If $N \in \mathcal{N}_2(\mathcal{A})$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{F}$, then, for any $A \in \mathcal{A}$, we have

$$[\Phi(A), \Phi(\lambda I + N)]_3 = [A, \lambda I + N]_3 = [A, N]_3 = 0.$$

By the surjectivity of Φ and Lemma 2.3, we see that $\Phi(\lambda I + N) \in \mathbb{F}I + \mathcal{N}_2(\mathcal{A})$.

On the other hand, if $\Phi(B) = \lambda I + N$ for some scalar λ and $N \in \mathcal{N}_2(\mathcal{A})$, then

$$[A, B]_3 = [\Phi(A), \Phi(B)]_3 = [\Phi(A), \lambda I + N]_3 = [\Phi(A), N]_3 = 0$$

for all $A \in \mathcal{A}$. By Lemma 2.3 again, we see that $B \in \mathbb{F}I + \mathcal{N}_2(\mathcal{A})$.

Hence $\Phi(\mathbb{F}I + \mathcal{N}_2(\mathcal{A})) = \mathbb{F}I + \mathcal{N}_2(\mathcal{A})$, completing the proof of the Step 2.

Step 3. For any nontrivial idempotent $P \in \mathcal{A}$, there exist three scalars λ_P, $\mu_P, \mu_{I-P} \in \mathbb{F}$ and an element $N_P \in \mathcal{N}_2(\mathcal{A})$ such that $\Phi(P) = \lambda_P P + \mu_P I + N_P$ and $\Phi(I-P) = \lambda_P(I - P) + \mu_{I-P} I - N_P$.

Let $P \in \mathcal{A}$ be a nontrivial idempotent and write $P_1 = P$ and $P_2 = I - P$. Then $\mathcal{A}$ can be written as $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_{11} + \mathcal{A}_{12} + \mathcal{A}_{21} + \mathcal{A}_{22}$, where $\mathcal{A}_{ij} = P_i \mathcal{A} P_j$ $(i, j \in \{1, 2\})$. Write $\Phi(P) = S_{11} + S_{12} + S_{21} + S_{22}$ with $S_{ij} \in \mathcal{A}_{ij}$.

We check Step 3 by several claims.

Claim 3.1. For any $A \in \mathcal{A}$, we have $[A, \Phi(P)]_3 \in \mathcal{A}_{12} + \mathcal{A}_{21}$.

Note that, for any $A \in \mathcal{A}$, we have

$$[A, P]_2 = PA(I - P) + (I - P)AP \in \mathcal{A}_{12} + \mathcal{A}_{21}.$$

Also notice that $[A, Q] = [A, Q]_3$ holds for any $A, Q \in \mathcal{A}$ with Q an idempotent. So we have $[A, P]_3 = [A, P]_5 = [[A, P]_3, P]_2$, which implies that

$$[\Phi(A), \Phi(P)]_3 = [[\Phi(A), \Phi(P)]_3, P]_2$$

holds for any $A \in \mathcal{A}$. By the surjectivity of Φ one gets

$$[A, \Phi(P)]_3 = [[A, \Phi(P)]_3, P]_2 \text{ for all } A \in \mathcal{A}.$$

Therefore, for any A we have

$$[A, \Phi(P)]_3 \in \mathcal{A}_{12} + \mathcal{A}_{21}.$$

The next claim is one of the key steps for our proof.

Claim 3.2. $S_{12} = S_{21} = 0$.

Taking $A = A_{11} \in \mathcal{A}_{11}$ and applying Claim 3.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = &\ (I - P)[A_{11}, \Phi(P)]_3(I - P) \\ = &\ 3S_{21}S_{11}A_{11}S_{12} + 3S_{22}S_{21}A_{11}S_{12} - 3S_{21}A_{11}S_{11}S_{12} - 3S_{21}A_{11}S_{12}S_{22}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$(S_{21}S_{11} + S_{22}S_{21})A_{11}S_{12} = S_{21}A_{11}(S_{11}S_{12} + S_{12}S_{22})$$

holds for all $A_{11} \in \mathcal{A}_{11}$, that is,

$$(S_{21}S_{11} + S_{22}S_{21})PAPS_{12} = S_{21}PAP(S_{11}S_{12} + S_{12}S_{22}) \tag{2.2}$$

holds for all $A \in \mathcal{A}$. Thus, by Lemma 2.1, $S_{21}S_{11}+S_{22}S_{21}$ and S_{21} must be linearly dependent. It follows that

$$S_{21}S_{11} + S_{22}S_{21} = \lambda_1 S_{21} \tag{2.3}$$

for some $\lambda_1 \in \mathbb{F}$. Again by Eq.(2.2), we get

$$S_{11}S_{12} + S_{12}S_{22} = \lambda_1 S_{12}. \tag{2.4}$$

Taking $A = A_{12} \in \mathcal{A}_{12}$ and applying Claim 3.1, one gets

$$\begin{aligned}
0 =& P[A_{12}, \Phi(P)]_3 P \\
=& A_{12}S_{21}S_{11}^2 + A_{12}S_{21}S_{12}S_{21} + A_{12}S_{22}S_{21}S_{11} + A_{12}S_{22}S_{21}S_{12} \\
& - 3S_{11}A_{12}S_{21}S_{11} - 3S_{11}A_{12}S_{22}S_{21} + 3S_{11}^2A_{12}S_{21} + 3S_{12}S_{21}A_{12}S_{21}
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
0 =& (I-P)[A_{12}, \Phi(P)]_3 (I-P) \\
=& - S_{21}S_{11}^2A_{12} - S_{22}S21S_{11}A_{12} - S_{21}S_{12}S_{21}A_{12} - S_{22}^2S_{21}A_{12} \\
& - 3S_{21}A_{12}S_{21}S_{12} - 3S_{21}A_{12}S_{22}^2 + 3S_{21}S_11A_{12}S_{22} + 3S_{22}S_{21}A_{12}S_{22}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
& A_{12}[S_{21}(S_{11}^2 + S_{12}S_{21}) + S_{22}(S_{21}S_{11} + S_{22}S_{21})] \\
= \;& 3S_{11}A_{12}(S_{21}S_{11} + S_{22}S_{21}) - 3(S_{11}^2 + S_{12}S_{21})A_{12}S_{21}
\end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& [S_{21}(S_{11}^2 + S_{12}S_{21}) + S_{22}(S_{21}S_{11} + S_{22}S_{21})]A_{12} \\
= \;& 3S_{21}A_{12}(S_{22}^2 + S_{21}S_{12}) - 3(S_{21}S_{11} + S_{22}S_{21})A_{12}S_{22}
\end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

hold for all $A_{12} \in \mathcal{A}_{12}$.

Similarly, by taking $A = A_{21}$ and applying Claim 3.1, one gets

$$\begin{aligned}
0 =& P[A_{21}, \Phi(P_1)]_3 P \\
=& S_{11}^2S_{12}A_{21} + S_{11}S_{12}S_{22}A_{21} + S_{12}S22^2A_{21} + S_{12}S_{21}S_{12}A_{21} \\
& - 3S_{11}S_{12}A_{21}S_{11} - 3S_{12}S_{22}A_{21}S_{11} + 3S_{12}A_{21}S_{11}^2 + 3S_{12}A_{21}S_{12}S_{21}
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
0 =& (I-P)[A_{21}, \Phi(P)]_3 (I-P) \\
=& A_{21}S_{11}^2S_{12} + A_{21}S_{11}S_{12}S_{22} + A_{21}S_{12}S_{22}^2 + A_{21}S_{12}S_{21}S_{12} \\
& - 3S_{22}A_{21}S_{11}S_{12} - 3S_{22}A_{21}S_{12}S_{22} + 3S_{22}^2A_{21}S_{12} + 3S_{21}S_{12})A_{21}S_{12},
\end{aligned}$$

which imply that

$$\begin{aligned} & [S_{11}(S_{11}S_{12}+S_{12}S_{22})+S_{12}(S_{22}^2+S_{21}S_{12})]A_{21} \\ = \;& 3(S_{11}S_{12}+S_{12}S_{22})A_{21}S_{11}-3S_{12}A_{21}(S_{11}^2+S_{12}S_{21}) \end{aligned} \tag{2.7}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & A_{21}[S_{11}(S_{11}S_{12}+S_{12}S_{22})+S_{12}(S_{22}^2+S_{21}S_{12})] \\ = \;& 3S_{22}A_{21}(S_{11}S_{12}+S_{12}S_{22})-3(S_{22}^2+S_{21}S_{12})A_{21}S_{12} \end{aligned} \tag{2.8}$$

hold for all $A_{21}\in\mathcal{A}_{21}$. Obviously, Eqs.(2.3) $\sim$ (2.8) together are equivalent to say that

$$\begin{cases} PA[S_{21}(S_{11}^2+S_{12}S_{21})+S_{22}(S_{21}S_{11}+S_{22}S_{21})]=[3\lambda_1S_{11}-3(S_{11}^2+S_{12}S_{21})]AS_{21}, \\ [S_{21}(S_{11}^2+S_{12}S_{21})+S_{22}(S_{21}S_{11}+S_{22}S_{21})]A(I-P)=S_{21}A[3\lambda_1S_{22}-3(S_{22}^2+S_{21}S_{12})], \\ [S_{11}(S_{11}S_{12}+S_{12}S_{22})+S_{12}(S_{22}^2+S_{21}S_{12})]AP=S_{12}AP[3\lambda_1S_{11}-3(S_{11}^2+S_{12}S_{21})], \\ (I-P)A[S_{11}(S_{11}S_{12}+S_{12}S_{22})+S_{12}(S_{22}^2+S_{21}S_{12})] \\ \quad =[3\lambda_1S_{22}-3(S_{22}^2+S_{21}S_{12})](I-P)AS_{12} \end{cases}$$

hold for all $A\in\mathcal{A}$.

Thus, by Lemma 2.1, we see that $3\lambda_1S_{11}-3(S_{11}^2+S_{12}S_{21})$ and P are linearly dependent. So

$$3\lambda_1S_{11}-3(S_{11}^2+S_{12}S_{21})=\lambda_2P \tag{2.9}$$

for some $\lambda_2\in\mathbb{F}$. This entails that

$$[S_{21}(S_{11}^2+S_{12}S_{21})+S_{22}(S_{21}S_{11}+S_{22}S_{21})]=\lambda_2S_{21}, \tag{2.10}$$

$$[S_{11}(S_{11}S_{12}+S_{12}S_{22})+S_{12}(S_{22}^2+S_{21}S_{12})]=\lambda_2S_{12} \tag{2.11}$$

and

$$[3\lambda_1S_{22}-3(S_{22}^2+S_{21}S_{12})]=\lambda_2(I-P). \tag{2.12}$$

It is easily checked by Eqs.(2.9) $\sim$ (2.12) that

$$(\lambda_1^2-\frac{4\lambda_2}{3})S_{21}=0 \quad\text{and}\quad (\lambda_1^2-\frac{4\lambda_2}{3})S_{12}=0.$$

If $\lambda_1^2-\frac{4\lambda_2}{3}=0$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} & (\Phi(P)-\tfrac{\lambda_1}{2}I)^2 \\ = \;& (S_{11}+S_{12}+S_{21}+S_{22}-\tfrac{\lambda_1}{2}I)^2 \\ = \;& (S_{11}^2+S_{12}S_{21})+(S_{11}S_{12}+S_{12}S_{22})+(S_{21}S_{11}+S_{22}S_{21}) \\ & +(S_{22}^2+S_{21}S_{12})-\lambda_1S_{11}-\lambda_1S_{12}-\lambda_1S_{21}-\lambda_1S_{22}+\tfrac{\lambda_1^2}{4}I \\ = \;& (\lambda_1S_{11}-\tfrac{\lambda_2}{3}P)+\lambda_1S_{12}+\lambda_1S_{21}+(\lambda_1S_{22}-\tfrac{\lambda_2}{3}(I-P))-\lambda_1S_{11} \\ & -\lambda_1S_{12}-\lambda_1S_{21}-\lambda_1S_{22}+\tfrac{\lambda_1^2}{4}I \\ = \;& (\tfrac{\lambda_1^2}{4}-\tfrac{\lambda_2}{3})I=0. \end{aligned}$$

Let $N_P = \Phi(P) - \frac{\lambda_1}{2}I$; then $\Phi(P) = \frac{\lambda_1}{2}I + N_P$ with $N_P^2 = 0$. But, by Step 2, this implies $P = \lambda I + N$ for some $\lambda \in \mathbb{F}$ and some $N \in \mathcal{N}_2(\mathcal{A})$, a contradiction. So we must have $\lambda_1^2 - \frac{4\lambda_2}{3} \neq 0$. Hence $S_{12} = S_{21} = 0$ and $\Phi(P) = S_{11} + S_{22}$.

Next, let us determine S_{11} and S_{22}.

Taking $A = A_{11}$ and applying Claim 3.1, we have

$$[A_{11}, S_{11}]_3 = A_{11}S_{11}^3 - 3S_{11}A_{11}S_{11}^2 + 3S_{11}^2A_{11}S_{11} - S_{11}^3A_{11} = P[A_{11}, \Phi(P)]_3P = 0$$

holds for all $A_{11} \in \mathcal{A}_{11}$. As $\mathcal{A}_{11}$ is clearly a standard operator algebra in $\mathcal{B}(PX)$, by Lemma 2.3, $S_{11} = \lambda_1 P + N_1$ with $N_1^2 = 0$ for some $\lambda_1 \in \mathbb{F}$ and some $N_1 \in \mathcal{N}_2(\mathcal{A}_{11})$. A similar argument can show that $S_{22} = \mu_P(I - P) + N_2$ for some $\mu_P \in \mathbb{F}$ and some $N_2 \in \mathcal{N}_2(\mathcal{A}_{22})$. Hence

$$\Phi(P) = \lambda_1 P + N_1 + \mu_P(I - P) + N_2 = \lambda_P P + \mu_P I + N_P,$$

where $\lambda_P = \lambda_1 - \mu_P$ with $N_P = N_1 + N_2$, $N_P^2 = 0$ and $N_1N_2 = N_2N_1 = 0$.

Similarly, we can get $\Phi(I - P) = \lambda_{I-P}(I - P) + \mu_{I-P}I + N_{I-P}$ for some $\lambda_{I-P}, \mu_{I-P} \in \mathbb{F}$ and $N_{I-P} \in \mathcal{N}_2(\mathcal{A})$.

Claim 3.3. $\lambda_P = \lambda_{(I-P)}$ and $N_{I-P} = -N_P$.

By Step 1 and Claim 3.2, there exists some scalar $c \in \mathbb{F}$, such that

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(I) &= \Phi(P) + \Phi(I - P) + cI \\ &= \lambda_P P + \mu_P I + N_P + \lambda_{I-P}(I - P) + \mu_{I-P}I + N_{I-P} + cI \\ &= (\lambda_P - \lambda_{I-P})P + (\mu_P + \mu_{I-P} + c)I + N_P + N_{I-P}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.13}$$

Since $\Phi(I) \in \mathbb{F}I$ by Step 2, there exist two scalars $\alpha, t \in \mathbb{F}$, with $t = \lambda_P - \lambda_{I-P}$ such that

$$tP + N_P + N_{I-P} = \alpha I. \tag{2.14}$$

So

$$A(tP + N_P + N_{I-P}) = (tP + N_P + N_{I-P})A \text{ for all } A \in \mathcal{A}.$$

In particular, taking $A = N_P$ gives

$$tN_PP + N_PN_{I-P} = tPN_P + N_{I-P}N_P. \tag{2.15}$$

Recall that $N_P = N_1 + N_2$ with $N_i \in \mathcal{N}_2(\mathcal{A}_{ii})$, $i = 1, 2$. So $tN_PP = tPN_P = tN_1$ and hence, by Eq.(2.15), we have $N_PN_{I-P} = N_{I-P}N_P$. Then, it follows from Eq.(2.14) that

$$(tP - \alpha I)^2 = (N_P + N_{I-P})^2 = 2N_PN_{I-P}. \tag{2.16}$$

Note that $(N_PN_{I-P})^2 = 0$ as $N_PN_{I-P} = N_{I-P}N_P$. Thus, Eq.(2.16) entails that $t = \alpha = 0$, which, by Eq.(2.14), implies that $\lambda_{I-P} = \lambda_P$ and $N_{I-P} = -N_P$, as desired.

Step 4. For any idempotent $P \in \mathcal{A}$ of rank ≤ 2, we have $N_P = 0$; For any rank-1 idempotents P, Q with $PQ = QP = 0$, we have $\lambda_P = \lambda_Q$.

Assume that P is a rank-1 idempotent. By Step 3, there exist two scalars $\lambda_P, \mu_P \in \mathbb{F}$ and an element $N_P \in \mathcal{N}_2(\mathcal{A})$, such that $\Phi(P) = \lambda_P P + \mu_P I + N_P$. Taking the space decomposition $X = X_1 \dot{+} X_2$ so that P has the matrix representation $P = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. Since $N_P = N_1 + N_2$ with $N_1 \in P\mathcal{A}P$ and $N_2 \in (I-P)\mathcal{A}(I-P)$, we must have $N_1 = 0$ and hence $N_P = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & S \end{pmatrix}$ with $S^2 = 0$.

Assume $S \neq 0$, then there exists rank-1 idempotent $P_2' \in B((I-P)X)$, such that $P_2' S \neq 0$. Let $P_2 = 0 \oplus P_2'$, then $PP_2 = P_2 P$ and with respect to the space decomposition $X = PX \dot{+} P_2 X \dot{+} (I-P)(I-P_2)X$, we have

$$P = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad P_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Let

$$Q = P + P_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Obviously, $Q^2 = Q$. By Step 1 and Step 3, there exist scalars $c, \lambda_P, \lambda_{P_2}, \lambda_Q, \mu_Q, \mu_P, \mu_{P_2} \in \mathbb{F}$ and elements $N_Q, N_P, N_{P_2} \in \mathcal{N}_2(\mathcal{A})$ with

$$N_Q = \begin{pmatrix} t_{11} & t_{12} & 0 \\ t_{21} & t_{22} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & T \end{pmatrix}, \; N_P = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & s_{22} & S_{23} \\ 0 & S_{32} & S_{33} \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } N_{P_2} = \begin{pmatrix} r_{11} & 0 & R_{13} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ R_{31} & 0 & R_{33} \end{pmatrix}$$

such that

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_Q Q + \mu_Q I + N_Q = \; & \Phi(Q) = \Phi(P_1) + \Phi(P_2) + cI \\ = \; & \lambda_P P + \mu_P I + N_P + \lambda_{P_2} P_2 + \mu_{P_2} I + N_{P_2}. \end{aligned}$$

So we have

$$\begin{pmatrix} \lambda_Q+\mu_Q & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda_Q+\mu_Q & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \mu_Q \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} t_{11} & t_{12} & 0 \\ t_{21} & t_{22} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & T \end{pmatrix}$$
$$= \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_P+\mu_P+\mu_{P_2}+c & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda_{P_2}+\mu_P+\mu_{P_2}+c & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \mu_P+\mu_{P_2}+c \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} r_{11} & 0 & R_{13} \\ 0 & s_{22} & S_{23} \\ R_{31} & S_{32} & S_{33}+R_{33} \end{pmatrix},$$

which entails that $t_{12}=t_{21}=0$, $R_{13}=0$, $R_{31}=0$, $S_{23}=0$ and $S_{32}=0$. Since $N_Q^2=0$, we get also $t_{11}=t_{22}=0$. Then, as $N_P^2=0$ and $N_{P_2}^2=0$, one gets further that $s_{22}=r_{11}=0$. So N_P has the form $N_P=\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & S_{33} \end{pmatrix}$; that is $S=\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & S_{33} \end{pmatrix}$. However, as ${P_2}'=\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, we get a contradiction ${P_2}'S=S{P_2}'=0$. Hence we must have $N_P=0$. Moreover,

$$\lambda_P+\mu_P+\mu_{P_2}+c=\lambda_Q+\mu_Q=\lambda_{P_2}+\mu_P+\mu_{P_2}+c.$$

This forces that $\lambda_{P_2}=\lambda_P$. It follows that $T=0$; that is $N_Q=0$, too.

Note that, for the case when $\dim X\geq 3$, we also have $\mu_Q=\mu_P+\mu_{P_2}+c$ and hence $\lambda_Q=\lambda_P$.

If P is an idempotent of rank 2, taking rank-1 idempotent P_1, P_2 so that $P=P_1+P_2$, then the above argument shows that $N_P=0$. So, the assertion of Step 4 is true.

Step 5. Assume $\dim X\geq 3$. $\lambda^4=1$ and there exists a functional $h:\mathcal{A}\to\mathbb{F}$ such that $\Phi(A)=\lambda A+h(\mathcal{A})I$ for any $A\in\mathcal{A}$.

We first show that, if $\dim X\geq 3$, then there exists a scalar $\lambda\in\mathbb{F}$ such that, for any rank-1 idempotent $P\in\mathcal{A}$, $\Phi(P)=\lambda P+\mu_P I$ for some $\mu_P\in\mathbb{F}$. In fact, for any rank one idempotent operators P, Q, as $\dim X\geq 3$, there exists rank-1 idempotent R such that $PR=RP=QR=RQ=0$. It follows from Step 4 that $\lambda_P=\lambda_R=\lambda_Q$. Hence, there exists a scalar λ such that $\lambda_P=\lambda$ for any rank-1 idempotent P.

Thus, for any rank-1 idempotents P, $Q\in\mathcal{A}$, we have

$$[P,Q]_3=[\Phi(P),\Phi(Q)]_3=[\lambda P,\lambda Q]_3=\lambda^4[P,Q]_3.$$

It follows that $\lambda^4=1$ as there are rank-1 idempotents P, Q so that $[P,Q]_3\neq 0$.

Now, for any A and any rank-1 idempotent P in $\mathcal{A}$, we have

$$[A,P]_3=[\Phi(A),\Phi(P)]_3=[\Phi(A),\lambda P]_3=\lambda^3[\Phi(A),P]_3,$$

which is equivalent to $[\Phi(A) - \lambda A, P]_3 = 0$ holds for any rank-1 idempotent $P \in \mathcal{A}$. By applying Lemma 2.2, there exists a scalar $\mu_A \in \mathbb{F}$, such that $\Phi(A) - \lambda A = \mu_A I$, that is

$$\Phi(A) = \lambda A + \mu_A I.$$

Define a functional $h : \mathcal{A} \to \mathbb{F}$ by $h(A) = \mu_A$ for any $A \in \mathcal{A}$. Then we get $\Phi(A) = \lambda A + h(A)I$. This completes the proof Theorem 1.1 for the case when $\dim X \geq 3$.

Step 6. Assume $\dim X = 2$. There exists a scalar λ with $\lambda^4 = 1$ and a functional $h : \mathcal{A} \to \mathbb{F}$ such that $\Phi(A) = \lambda A + h(A)I$ for any $A \in \mathcal{A}$.

Fixing a basis $\{e_1, e_2\}$ of X, $\mathcal{A}$ may be identified with the matrix algebra $\mathcal{M}_2 = \mathcal{M}_2(\mathbb{F})$ of all 2 by 2 matrices over $\mathbb{F}$. So, we may regard the map Φ as a map between $\mathcal{M}_2(\mathbb{F})$ in the case when $\dim X = 2$.

Let $E_{11} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $E_{22} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$, $E_{12} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ and $E_{21} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. Then every $A \in \mathcal{A}$ can be written as $A = a_{11}E_{11} + a_{12}E_{12} + a_{21}E_{21} + a_{22}E_{22}$, where $a_{ij} \in \mathbb{F}$.

By Step 3-4, there exist scalars λ, μ_i such that $\Phi(E_{ii}) = \lambda E_{ii} + \mu_i I$, $i = 1, 2$.

We will check Step 6 by three claims.

Claim 6.1. If $1 \leq i \neq j \leq 2$, then, for any $a_{ij} \in \mathbb{F}$, there exists a scalar $\mu_{a_{ij}} \in \mathbb{F}$, such that $\Phi(a_{ij}E_{ij}) = \lambda^{-3}a_{ij}E_{ij} + \mu_{a_{ij}}I$.

Here, we only give the proof for the case when $(i, j) = (1, 2)$. The proof for $(i, j) = (2, 1)$ is similar.

For any $a_{12} \in \mathbb{F}$, write $\Phi(a_{12}E_{12}) = s_{11}E_{11} + s_{12}E_{12} + s_{21}E_{21} + s_{22}E_{22}$ with $s_{ij} \in \mathbb{F}$. Then, by Step 4, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} -a_{12}E_{12} &= [a_{12}E_{12}, E_{11}]_3 = [\Phi(a_{12}E_{12}), \Phi(E_{11})]_3 \\ &= [s_{11}E_{11} + s_{12}E_{12} + s_{21}E_{21} + s_{22}E_{22}, \lambda E_{11} + \mu_1 I]_3 \\ &= \lambda^3[s_{11}E_{11} + s_{12}E_{12} + s_{21}E_{21} + s_{22}E_{22}, E_{11}]_3 \\ &= \lambda^3(s_{21}E_{21} - s_{12}E_{12}), \end{aligned}$$

which entails that $s_{21} = 0$ and $\lambda^3 s_{12} = a_{12}$. So $s_{12} = \lambda^{-3}a_{12}$ and

$$\Phi(a_{12}E_{12}) = \lambda^{-3}a_{12}E_{12} + s_{11}E_{11} + s_{22}E_{22}.$$

On the other hand, by Step 2, we get $\Phi(a_{12}E_{12}) = \mu I + N$ for some $\mu \in \mathbb{F}$ and $N \in \mathcal{N}_2(\mathcal{M}_2)$ with $N = \begin{pmatrix} r_{11} & r_{12} \\ r_{21} & r_{22} \end{pmatrix}$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} &\lambda^{-3}a_{12}E_{12} + s_{11}E_{11} + s_{22}E_{22} = \mu I + N \\ &= (\mu + r_{11})E_{11} + r_{12}E_{12} + r_{21}E_{21} + (\mu + r_{22})E_{22}. \end{aligned}$$

This gives that $r_{21}=0$, $r_{12}=\lambda^{-3}a_{12}$. Since $N^2=0$, we must have $r_{11}=r_{22}=0$, and then $s_{11}=s_{22}=\mu$. Thus one gets

$$\Phi(a_{12}E_{12})=\lambda^{-3}a_{12}E_{12}+\mu_{a_{12}}E_{11}+\mu_{a_{12}}E_{22}=\lambda^{-3}a_{12}E_{12}+\mu_{a_{12}}I,$$

with $\mu_{a_{12}}=\mu$, as desired.

Claim 6.2. $\lambda^4=1$ and, for any $a_{ii}\in\mathbb{F}_{ii}$, $(i\in\{1,2\})$, there exists a scalar $\mu_{a_{ii}}\in\mathbb{F}$, such that $\Phi(a_{ii}E_{ii})=\lambda a_{ii}E_{ii}+\mu_{a_{ii}}I$.

Still, we only prove that the claim holds for the case $i=1$.

Take any nonzero $a_{11}\in\mathbb{F}$ and write $\Phi(a_{11}E_{11})=s_{11}E_{11}+s_{12}E_{12}+s_{21}E_{21}+s_{22}E_{22}$ with $s_{ij}\in\mathbb{F}$. By Step 4, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}0&=[a_{11}E_{11},E_{11}]_3=[\Phi(a_{11}E_{11}),\Phi(E_{11})]_3\\&=[s_{11}E_{11}+s_{12}E_{12}+s_{21}E_{21}+s_{22}E_{22},\lambda E_{11}+\mu_1 I]_3\\&=\lambda^3(s_{21}E_{21}-s_{12}E_{12}).\end{aligned}$$

Hence $s_{21}=s_{12}=0$ and $\Phi(a_{11}E_{11})=s_{11}E_{11}+s_{22}E_{22}$. By Claim 6.1, there exists a scalar $\mu_{E_{12}}\in\mathbb{F}$, such that $\Phi(E_{12})=\lambda^{-3}E_{12}+\mu_{E_{12}}I$. Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned}-a_{11}^3E_{12}&=[E_{12},a_{11}E_{11}]_3=[\Phi(E_{12}),\Phi(a_{11}E_{11})]_3\\&=[\lambda^{-3}E_{12}+\mu_{E_{12}}I,s_{11}E_{11}+s_{22}E_{22}]_3\\&=\lambda^{-3}(s_{22}-s_{11})^3E_{12}.\end{aligned}$$

So

$$(s_{11}-s_{22})^3=\lambda^3a_{11}^3,$$

which implies that

$$s_{11}-s_{22}=\delta\lambda a_{11}$$

for some δ with $\delta^3=1$. It follows that

$$\Phi(a_{11}E_{11})=s_{11}E_{11}+s_{22}E_{22}=(\delta\lambda a_{11}+s_{22})E_{11}+s_{22}E_{22}=\delta\lambda a_{11}E_{11}+s_{22}I.$$

Applying Step 1 and Claim 6.1, it is easily checked that

$$\begin{aligned}4a_{11}(E_{12}-E_{21})&=[a_{11}E_{11},E_{12}+E_{21}]_3\\&=[\Phi(a_{11}E_{11}),\Phi(E_{12}+E_{21})]_3=[\delta\lambda a_{11}E_{11},\lambda^{-3}(E_{12}+E_{21})]_3\\&=\delta\lambda^{-8}a_{11}[E_{11},E_{12}+E_{21}]_3=4\delta\lambda^{-8}a_{11}(E_{12}-E_{21}).\end{aligned}$$

So we get $\delta=\lambda^8$ and then

$$\Phi(a_{11}E_{11})=\lambda^9a_{11}E_{11}+\mu_{a_{11}}I$$

with $\mu_{a_{11}} = s_{22}$. Note that, we already had $\Phi(E_{11}) = \lambda E_{11} + \mu_1 I$. This gives $\lambda^8 = 1$ and hence

$$\Phi(a_{11}E_{11}) = \lambda a_{11}E_{11} + \mu_{a_{11}} I$$

holds for all $a_{11} \in \mathbb{F}$. In fact, we have $\lambda^4 = 1$. To see this, notice that, by Step 1 and Claim 6.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} E_{21} + E_{22} - E_{11} &= [E_{21}, E_{11} + E_{12}]_3 = [\Phi(E_{21}), \Phi(E_{11} + E_{12})]_3 \\ &= [\lambda^{-3}E_{21}, \lambda E_{11} + \lambda^{-3}E_{12}]_3 = E_{21} + \lambda^{-4}E_{22} - \lambda^{-4}E_{11}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that $\lambda^4 = 1$.

Claim 6.3. There exists a functional h on $\mathcal{M}_2$ such that $\Phi(A) = \lambda A + h(\mathcal{A})I$ for any $A \in \mathcal{M}_2$.

As $\lambda^{-3} = \lambda$, by Claims 6.1-6.2, we have that $\Phi(a_{ij}E_{ij}) = \lambda a_{ij}E_{ij} + \mu_{a_{ij}} I$ for any $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$ and any $a_{ij} \in \mathbb{F}$. Then, for any $A \in \mathcal{M}_2$, writing $A = a_{11}E_{11} + a_{12}E_{12} + a_{21}E_{21} + a_{22}E_{22}$ with $a_{ij} \in \mathbb{F}$ and applying Step 1, there exists some scalar c_A such that

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(A) = &\ \Phi(a_{11}E_{11}) + \Phi(a_{12}E_{12}) + \Phi(a_{21}E_{21}) + \Phi(a_{22}E_{22}) + c_A I \\ = &\ \lambda a_{11}E_{11} + \mu_{a_{11}} I + \lambda a_{12}E_{12} + \mu_{a_{12}} I + \lambda a_{21}E_{21} \\ &+ \mu_{a_{21}} I + \lambda a_{22}E_{22} + \mu_{a_{22}} I + c_A I \\ = &\ \lambda A + (\mu_{a_{11}} + \mu_{a_{12}} + \mu_{a_{21}} + \mu_{a_{22}} + c_A)I = \lambda A + \mu_A I. \end{aligned}$$

Let $h : \mathcal{A} \to \mathbb{F}$ be a functional defined by $h(A) = \mu_A$ for any $A \in \mathcal{M}_2$. Then we get $\Phi(A) = \lambda A + h(A)I$ for any $A \in \mathcal{M}_2$.

The proof of Theorem 1.1 is completed. □

References

[1] H. E. Bell, M. N. Daif, On commutativity and strong commutativity preserving maps, Can. Math. Bull., 37 (1994), 443-447.

[2] M. Brešar. Commuting traces of biadditive mappings, commutativity preserving mappings and Lie mappings, Trans. Am. Math. Soc., 335 (1993), 525-546.

[3] M. Brešar, C. R. Miers, Commutativity preserving mapping of von Neumann algebras, Canad. J. Math., 45 (1993), 659-708.

[4] M. Brešar, C. R. Miers, Strong commutativity preserving maps of semiprime rings, Can. Math. Bull., 37 (1994), 457-460.

[5] Q. Deng, M. Ashraf, On strong commutativity preserving maps. Results Math., 30 (1996), 259-263.

[6] C.-K. Fong, A. R. Sourour, On the operator equation $\sum_{i=1}^{n} A_i X B_i \equiv 0$, Canad. J. Math., 31 (1979), 845-857.

[7] L. Liu, Strong commutativity preserving maps on von Neumann algebras, Linear and Multilinear Algebra., 63 (2015), 490-496.

[8] J.-S. Lin , C.-K. Liu, Strong commutativity preserving maps on Lie ideals, Linear Algebra Appl., 428 (2008), 1601-1609.

[9] L. Molnár, P. Šemrl, Non-linear commutativity preserving maps on self-adjont operators, Q. J. Math., 56(2005), 589-595.

[10] X.- F. Qi, Strong 2-commutativity preserving maps on prime rings.

[11] X.-F. Qi, J.-C. Hou, Nonlinear strong commutativity preserving maps on triangular algebras, Oper. Matrices., 6 (2012), 147-158.

[12] X.-F. Qi, J.-C. Hou, Nonlinear strong commutativity preserving maps Comm. Algebra., 38 (2010), 2790-2796.

[13] J.-H. Zhang, Nonlinear maps preserving Lie products on factor von Neumann algebras, Linear Algebra Appl., 429 (2008), 18-30.

Department of Mathematics, Taiyuan University of Technology , Taiyuan 030024, P. R. of China

E-mail address: liumeiyunmath@163.com; jinchuanhou@aliyun.com